

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

STATON TECHIYA, LLC, SYNERGY IP
CORPORATION,

Plaintiffs,

V.

SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD.,
SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS AMERICA,
INC.,

Defendants.

§ § § § § § § § § §

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:21-CV-00413-JRG
(LEAD CASE)

CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:22-CV-00053-JRG
(MEMBER CASE)

ORDER

Before the Court is the Motion to Redact Confidential Information from the Bench Trial Transcript (the “Motion”) filed by Defendants Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung Electronics America, Inc. (“Samsung”). (Dkt. No. 920). In the Motion, Samsung requests “that select, limited portions of the transcripts from the bench trial held on March 26, 2024 and March 27, 2024, be redacted and sealed.” (*Id.* at 1). Samsung contends that it “will be harmed if the highly confidential, sensitive business information regarding the amount of licensing offers discussed during the bench trial is made public.” (*Id.*). Samsung notes that “[t]he licensing offer amounts discussed at trial are not public and were made under a non-disclosure agreement between Samsung and Techiya.” (*Id.*). Samsung argues that because it “regularly participates in competitive patent licensing negotiations, exposing confidential licensing negotiations and offers would allow Samsung’s competitors access to information about prior offers and Samsung’s willingness (or lack thereof) to engage in negotiations and exchange offers of certain amounts regarding certain patents.” (*Id.*). Specifically, Samsung requests that the following page and line numbers of the

Bench Trial Transcripts (Dkt. Nos. 900 and 901) be redacted and sealed because “[t]hese portions discuss the amounts of confidential licensing offers”:

Transcript Date	Citation (Page: Line Number)	Summary
March 26, 2024	37:15	Licensing offer
March 26, 2024	38:21	Licensing offer
March 26, 2024	40:22	Licensing offer
March 26, 2024	40:24-25	Licensing offer
March 26, 2024	41:4	Licensing offer
March 26, 2024	190:18	Licensing offer
March 26, 2024	190:20	Licensing offer
March 26, 2024	190:23	Licensing offer
March 26, 2024	191:11	Licensing offer
March 26, 2024	191:18	Licensing offer
March 26, 2024	205:10	Licensing offer
March 26, 2024	206:16-17	Licensing offer
March 26, 2024	206:23-24	Licensing offer
March 26, 2024	207:1	Licensing offer
March 26, 2024	207:6-7	Licensing offer
March 26, 2024	207:9	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	69:25-70:1	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	74:9	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	76:2-3	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	76:23-24	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	79:17-18	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	80:4-5	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	80:12	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	128:19	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	128:22	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	129:6	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	129:9	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	133:9	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	163:19	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	163:22	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	164:10	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	226:3	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	226:5-6	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	226:11	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	226:13	Licensing offer
March 27, 2024	279:21-22	Licensing offer

(*Id.* at 1, 3).


Plaintiff Staton Techiya, LLC (“Techiya”) opposes the relief requested in the Motion on the bases that: (1) “the information Samsung seeks to redact was elicited by Samsung in open court without reservation and Samsung never objected to any other disclosure nor made any effort to seal the courtroom to prevent disclosure”¹; (2) “the information is essential for the public to

¹ Samsung contends that “[d]uring the portions of the bench trial where any licensing offer was discussed, no public parties were present in the Courtroom, only Court personnel and the parties participating in the trial.” (Dkt. No. 920 at 1).

understand and evaluate the parties arguments and thus the public has a significant interest therein”; and (3) “Samsung has failed to provide ‘compelling reasons’ supporting the after-the-fact redaction from the public trial transcript of the offer amounts exchanged between Samsung and Synergy.” (Dkt. No. 922). The Court is not persuaded by Techiya’s arguments in opposition to the Motion.

Having considered the Motion, the Court finds that it should be and hereby is **GRANTED**. Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** that the publicly available versions of the Bench Trial Transcripts (Dkt. Nos. 900 and 901) be redacted consistent with Exhibits 1 and 2 of the Motion (Dkt. Nos. 920-1 and 920-2) and that the Bench Trial Transcripts in unredacted form (Dkt. Nos. 900 and 901) be maintained under seal.

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 24th day of May, 2024.



RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE